

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In view of the agreements reached with the Examiner during the personal interview on April 26, 2005 and the changes proposed to claims 1, 8 and 15, entry of this amendment/response after final and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

Initially, the Applicant would like to thank Examiner Hailu for the courteous interview extended their representative on April 26, 2005. During the personal interview, differences between the present invention and the applied prior art, both of which are assigned to the same assignee and are concerned with the same model laundry appliance built by the assignee, were discussed. With reference to the limitations of the independent claims in this application and Figure 2B of the present application, it was particular pointed out that the display screen for the appliance in accordance with the present invention must be divided into a plurality of zones, with this clearly be shown at 250 in Figure 2B with reference to zones 15-20. One of the plurality of zones (shown as zone 18) must display a first set of information. In going from the arrangement shown at display 250 to that shown at 300 in Figure 2B, the zone containing the first set of information is enlarged so as to substantially, entirely encompass the screen, while automatically presenting a second set of information representing additional details concerning the first set of information. In the preferred embodiment of the invention shown in Figure 2B, the first set of information constitutes error and help codes. Although it would be preferable to provide the additional details of these error and help codes, this information cannot fit in only one section of the screen, i.e., one of the plurality of zones. Therefore, if it is necessary to have additional details on this first set of information, that zone of the screen is enlarged to that shown in screen 300. As depicted, screen 300 includes both the first set of information and the second set of information. In this sense, any portion of the information presented in the zone which may have been truncated or the like can be depicted when that zone is enlarged.

In utilizing the Blair et al. reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,502,265) against the claims of the present application, the Examiner correctly identifies that the screen shown in this patent can be divided into a plurality of zones. The Examiner indicates that Figures 2, 8A and 8B illustrate providing a “first set of information” in one of the plurality of zones. During the personal interview, the Examiner identified that this “first set of information” was being read on a word placed in one of the zones. In the final Office Action, the Examiner provides the example of selecting “Hints and Tips” from screen 100 as the first set of information. However, it was agreed during the interview that the phrase “Hints and Tips” does not constitute a first set of information at all analogous to that of the present invention. However, the Applicant’s representative was more than willing to further clarify this point by amending the independent claims in this application to specify that the first set of information includes “a plurality of information data concerning operation of the appliance.” Again, in the example given in the present application concerning the help and error codes in zone 18 of Figure 2B, these error codes would already provide information to diagnostics personnel concerning errors that have occurred during operation of the appliance. If the personnel were readily familiar with the definition of these particular code numbers, there would be no need to enlarge the screen to that shown at 300. However, this enlargement can be performed to present the second set of information representing the additional details. Therefore, although it was agreed that the words in the Blair et al. arrangement do not equate to the claimed first set of information, the claims have still been amended in a manner agreed upon with the Examiner to further set forth clarifying language that the first set of information includes a plurality of informational data concerning operation of the appliance. Certainly, the phrase “Hints and Tips” does not constitute a first set of information or a plurality of informational data concerning operation of the appliance.

Of course, given the common assignee, the '265 patent does not constitute prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Therefore, based on the agreements reached with the Examiner regarding the differences of the first set of information verses the words presented on the screens of the Blair et al. patent, it is respectfully submitted that this reference does not anticipate the present invention and does not constitute prior art under any obviousness-type analysis. Also brought to the attention of the Examiner were further distinctions with respect to some of the dependent claims. For exemplary purposes, the Applicant discussed with the Examiner claims 2-4. With respect to claim 2, it was submitted that the first set of information must be in the form of codes. That is, this first set of information, which must be in one of the plurality of zones in the first screen as shown in connection with screen 250 in Figure 2B, is in the form of codes. Again, the Examiner referenced words in connection with the Blair et al. patent which are not in the form of codes. Claim 3 requires that the additional details define the codes. These additional details constitute the second set of information which is only presented when the zone containing the first set of information is enlarged such as in the case of achieving screen 300 shown in Figure 2B. With respect to claim 4, the first set of information must be presented as diagnostic codes. Again, this first set of information is provided in the "one of the plurality of zones" such that the words referenced by the Examiner were agreed upon as not constituting "diagnostic codes" as required by this claim. Therefore, these dependent claim limitations were simply presented to further identify clear distinctions between the claim subject matter and that set forth in the '265 patent, with these claim distinctions being readily agreed upon by the Examiner during the personal interview.

Based on the above remarks, the agreements reached with the Examiner during the personal interview and the manner in which the independent claims in this application have been amended without the introduction of any new matter, allowance of the claims and passage of the application to issue following entry of this amendment/response are respectfully requested. If the Examiner should have any additional concerns regarding

Application Serial No. 09/919,794  
Reply to Office Action dated January 4, 2005

**EXPEDITED HANDLING PROCEDURE  
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.116**

the allowance of this application, he is cordially invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided below to further expedite the prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,



Everett G. Diederiks, Jr.  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 33,323

Date: April 29, 2005  
**DIEDERIKS & WHITELAW, PLC**  
12471 Dillingham Square, #301  
Woodbridge, VA 22192  
Tel: (703) 583-8300  
Fax: (703) 583-8301